REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action dated June 29, 2004. Enclosed please find Form PTO-2038 and Form PTO/SB/22.

Abstract. The Examiner objects to the Abstract. A new Abstract is provided which is tied more closely to the claims of this application which remain after canceling the non-elected claims.

Claim amendment. One claim has been amended to correct a typographical error caused by defective PASAT e-filing software provided by the USPTO.

Art rejection. The Examiner rejects all pending claims as supposedly obvious over a two-way combination of a US pat. no. 5903892 to Hoffert et al. ("Hoffert") and a US pat. no. 643037 to Orr ("Orr").

Claim 1 is:

A method for use with **[a] first and second metadata streams with respect to a video stream**, the first metadata stream time-coded with respect to the video stream and the second metadata stream not time-coded with respect to the video stream, the method comprising the steps of:

[f] aligning the second metadata stream with the first metadata stream;

[g] adding time codes to the second metadata stream, based on the alignment;

[b] searching for proper names within the second metadata stream;

[c] finding faces within the video stream;

[d] matching faces with proper names; and

placing the **[e] matched faces and proper names** into a reference library.

The Examiner states that limitation [a] may be found at Hoffert column 3, lines 39. The undersigned has diligently searched this cited portion of Hoffert and is unable to find this limitation. The undersigned has also searched the full text of Hoffert and has been unable to find "metadata stream", let alone "first and second metadata streams." The Examiner is requested to state the page and line where, in Hoffert, this limitation may actually be found, in the absence of which the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that all of limitations [b], [c], [d], and [e] may be found in Hoffert at any of ten places in Hoffert. The undersigned has diligently studied these portions of

- 6 -

Hoffert and is unable to find any of these five limitations. Indeed, the undersigned has searched the full text of Hoffert and has been unable to find the phrase "proper name", the word "face", any mention of matching faces with proper names, or any mention of placing matched faces and proper names into a reference library.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where any "metadata stream" may be found.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where "first and second metadata streams" may be found.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where any "proper name" may be found.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where any "face" may be found.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where any "matching of faces with proper names" may be found.

In the absence of such page-and-line citations, it is requested that the rejection over Hoffert be withdrawn.

Importantly, the Examiner admits that Hoffert is lacking in any teaching of limitations [f] and [g]. In an effort to provide these missing limitations, the Examiner expresses the view that Orr somehow provides these missing limitations. This is supposedly provided in Orr at column 2, lines 15-55.

The undersigned has diligently studied this portion of Orr and cannot find any portion of limitations [f] and [g]. Indeed, the undersigned has searched the full text of Orr and cannot find the word "align", let alone "aligning the second metadata stream with the first metadata stream." The undersigned also cannot find "metadata" mentioned anywhere in Orr. Finally, the undersigned is unable to find adding of time codes to a second metadata stream anywhere in Orr.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where the word "align" may be found.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where "first and second datastreams" may be found, and aligned.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where the word "metadata" may be found.

The Examiner is requested to cite the page and line of Hoffert where "adding time codes

- 7 -

to a metadata stream" may be found.

In the absence of such page-and-line citations, it is requested that the rejection over Orr be withdrawn.

Claim 22 is:

A method for use with a metadata stream with respect to a video stream, the metadata stream time-coded with respect to the video stream, the method comprising the steps, performed by a computer, of:

searching for proper names within the metadata stream;

finding faces within the video stream;

matching faces with proper names; and

placing the matched faces and proper names into a reference library.

It appears to the undersigned that the two-way combination of Hoffert and Orr likewise fails to teach or suggest any of the limitations shown in bold type. The Examiner is requested to find even one of these four limitations and to cite to it by page and line. Again, the cited references do not even seem to mention "faces" or "proper names" or "matching faces with proper names." In the absence of such page and line citations, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 24 is:

A method for use with a metadata stream with respect to at least one video stream, the metadata stream time-coded with respect to the at least one video stream, the method comprising the steps, performed by a computer, of:

searching for proper names within the metadata stream;

finding faces within the at least one video stream;

matching faces with proper names;

placing the matched faces and proper names into a reference library; and

for a selected proper name, generating a list of locations within the at least one video stream associated with that selected proper name.

It appears to the undersigned that the two-way combination of Hoffert and Orr likewise fails to teach or suggest any of the limitations shown in bold type. The Examiner is

- 8 -

requested to find even one of these three limitations and to cite to it by page and line. Again, the cited references do not even seem to mention "faces" or "proper names" or "matching faces with proper names." In the absence of such page and line citations, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Oppedahl
PTO Reg. No. 32,746
Oppedahl & Larson LLP
P O Box 5068
Dillon, CO 80435-5068
telephone 970-468-6600

- 9 -